PACE 1/20 * RCVD AT 1/2/12006 12:23:27 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/37 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:972 3 5748867 * DURATION (mm-ss):09-54

RECEIVED IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFF CENTRAL FAX CENTER DEC 0.7 2006 URGENT BY FAX (20 pages)

BY FAX (571) 273-8300

In re Application of: HAMMER, Mordechai

Serial No. : 08/894,211

Filed : July 30, 1997

For : EXTENSIBLE AND RETRACTABLE

ELEMENTS AND VARIOUS USES FOR THE

ELEMENTS

Group Art Unit 3626 Examiner: John B. Walsh

Ramat-Gan, Israel December 7, 2006

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

In response to the last Office Action mailed **November 07, 2006,** and also to the Office Actions mailed **April 11, 2006** and **August 08, 2005**, kindly amend the above-identified application as follows:

Attached herewith:

- A. A complete listing of all the claims and with the new amendments in claim 50, as requested by the examiner in his Office Action mailed **November 07**, 2006, and August 08, 2005
- B. The listing of claims include now claim 50 with the double brackets as been asked by the Examiner in his Continuation Sheet in his Office Action mailed November 07, 2006.

1

- C. The listing of claims include the text of all pending claims. (including withdrawn claims)
- D. Each claim has been provided with the proper status identifier.

Remarks

1. This complete listing of all the claims was taken from the Examiner's Office Action mailed to the applicant in the date of **August 8**, **2005**.

In the Abstract:

In his Office Action mailed on the year of 2004, the examiner, Mr. John B. Walsh, wrote as fallow:

"... The applicant's corrections to the abstract have overcome the objection to the abstract noted in the previous office action and no further modifications are needed to the abstract at this time."

The applicant his asking from the Examiner to kindly explain:

- A. Why he did not asked this deleting of the last sentence from the abstract In his office action from the year of 2004?
- B. Why he allowed the abstract then?
- C. Why he changed his previous decision again and asked from the applicant to modify again his abstract by deleting the last sentence from it.?